The Star of Pascagoula.

"PEACE, GOOD WILL, AND PROSPERITY TO ALL MANKIND."

VOL. 2. No. 15 PASCAGOULA, JACKSON Co., MISS., SATURDAY MARCH 28th, 1874. WHOLE No. 382

Newspaper Laws.

We would call the especial attention of Postmasters and subscribers to the following synopsis of the newspaper laws:

1. A postmaster is required to give notice by letter (returning a paper does not answer the law) when a subscriber does not take his paper out of the office, and state the reasons for its not being taken, and a neglect to do so makes the post master responsible to the publisher for the payment.

2. Any person who takes a paper from the postoffice directed to his name or another, or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible to the publisher for the payment.

3. If a person orders his papers discontinued, he must pay all arrearages, or the publisher may continue to send it until the payment is made.

4. If the subscriber orders his paper discontinued, at a certain time, and the publisher continues to send it, the subscriber is bound to pay for it if he takes it from the office. The law proceeds upon the ground that a man must pay for what he uses.

The courts have decided that refusing to take newspapers and periodicals from he post office, or removing and leaving them uncalled for, is prima facia evidence of intentional fraud.

DAVIS AND LEE.

CAUSE OF FAILURE OF CONFEDERACY.

We reproduce from the speech of Hon. B. H. Hill of Georgia, before the Southern Historical Society of Atlanta, the following extracts in regard to President Davis add General Lee, and the merits of the issue, with our cause of failure:

* * * *

No people, ancient or modern, can look with more pride to the verdict which history will be compelled to render upon the merits and characters of our two chief leaders—the one in the military and the other in the civil service. Most other leaders are great because of fortunate results, and heroes because of success. Davis and Lee, because of qualities in themselves are great in the face of fortune, and heroes in spite of defeat.

When the future historian comes to survey the character of Lee, he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he will have to lift his eyes high towards heaven to catch its summit. He possessed every virtue of all other great commanders without their vices. He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile. He was Cæsar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life; but modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles.

There were many peculiarities in the habits and character of Lee, which are but little known and which may be studied with profit. He studiously avoided giving opinions upon subjects which it had not been his calling or training to investigate; and sometimes I thought he carried this great virtue too far. Neither the President, nor Congress, nor friends could get his views upon any public question not strictly military, and no man had as much quiet, unobtrusive contempt for what he called "military statesmen and political generals."

* * * *

Lee sometimes indulged in satire, to which his greatness gave point and power. He was especially severe on newspaper criticisms of military movements—subjects about which the writers knew nothing.

"We made a great mistake, *Mr.* Hill, in the begining of our struggle, and, I fear, in spite of all we can do, it will prove to be a fatal mistake," he said to me after General Bragg ceased to command the Army of Tennessee, an event Lee deplored.

"What mistake is that, General?"

"Why, sir, in the begining, we appointed all our worst Generals to command the armies, and all our best Generals to edit the newspapers. As you know, I have planned some campaigns and quite a number of battles. I have given the work all the care and thought I could, and sometimes when my plans were completed, as far as I could see, they seemed to be perfect. But, when I have fought them through, I have discovered defects, and occasionally wondered I did not see some of the defects in advance. When it was all over, I found by reading a newspaper that these best editor-generals saw all the defects plainly from the start. Unfortunately, they did not communicate their knowledge to me until it was too late." Then after a pause, he added with a beautiful, grave expression I can never forget: "I have no ambition but to serve the Confederacy, and do all I can to win our independence. I am willing to serve in any capacity to which the authorities may assign me. I have done the best I could in the field, and have not succeded as I could wish. I am willing to yield my place to these best Generals, and I will do my best for the cause editing a newspaper."

Jefferson Davis was as great in the field. He was more resentful in temper, and more aggressive in his nature than Lee. His position, too, was more exposed to assaults from within. He had to make all appointments, and though often upon the recommendation of others, all the blame of mistakes was charged to him, and mistakes were often charged by disappointed seekers and their friends which were not made. He also make recommendations for enactments, and though these measures, especially the military portion, invariably had the concurrence of, and often originated with Lee, the opposition of malcontents was directed at Davis. It is astonishing how men in high position, and supposed to be great, would make war on the whole administration for the most trivial personal disappointment. Failures to get places for favorites of very ordinary character has inspired long harrangues against the the most important measures, and they were continued and repeated even after those measures became laws. "Can you believe," he said to me once, "that men—statesmen—in a struggle like this, would hazard an injury to the cause because of their personal grievances, even if they were well founded?" "Certainly," I replied, "I not only believe it, but I know it. There are men who regard themselves with more devotion than they do the cause. If such men offer you council you do not take, or ask appointments you do not make, however you may be sustained in such action by Lee and all the Cabinet, and even the Congress, they accept your refusal as questioning their wisdom, and as personal war on them." "I cannot conceive of such a feeling," he said, "I have but one enemy to fight, and that is our common enemy. I may make mistakes, and doubtless I do, but I do the best I can with all the lights at the time before me. God knows I would sacrifice most willingly my life, much more my opinions, to defeat that enemy.

* * * *

I would be ashamed of my own unworthiness if I did not venerate Lee. I would scorn my own nature if I did not love Davis. I would question my own integrity and patriotism if I did not honor admire both. There are some who affect to praise Lee and condemn Davis. But of all such Lee himself would be ashamed. No two leaders ever leaned, each on the other, in such beautiful trust and absolute confidence. Hand in hand and heart in heart, they moved in the front of the dire struggle of their people for independence—a noble pair of brothers. And if fidelity to the right, endurance of trials, and sacrifice of self for others, can win title to a place with the good in the great Hereafter, then Davis and Lee will meet where wars are not waged and slanderers are not heard; and as heart in heart and wing to wing they fly through the courts of heaven, admiring angels will say, what a noble pair of brothers.

The saddest chapter in Confederate history which the future historian will be called to write will be that one in which he shall undertake to define the real cause of our failure. For the truth must be told.

Five millions of people in such a country as we possess were not conquered because our resources were inferior, or our enemies so powerful. All physical disadvantages are insufficent to account for our failure. The truth is, we failed because too many of our people were not determined to win. Malcontents at home and in high places took more men from Lee's army than did Grant's guns. The same agencies created dissensions among our people, and we failed to win independence because our sacrifices ceased, our purposes faltered, and our strength was divided. Kind judge, let this sad chapter be short!

But above all things we have least to dread in history are the merits of the issues which divided the contending parties. The Southern States and people must stand before the bar of history responsible for secession. The Northern States and people must stand before the same bar responsible for coercion and reconstruction. Weighed upon principle, by authority, and by effects and consequences, which of the two parties is the more inimical to the Union, to constitutional government and to liberty?

When the States formed the Union several of them, especially New York and Virginia, expressly reserved the right to with draw as a condition of ratification. This reservation, by a well-established rule of construction, enured to all the parties to the Union. But no State recognized coercion to preserve the Union, as a right or power in the Federal Government either expressed or resulting. So, in the very stipulations which made the Union, secession finds a justification and coercion none.

From 1787 to 1860 the ablest statesmen in America both in the North and in the South, conceded the right of secession to the States. Some insisted it was a constitutional right, inhering in the soverignty of the States, and conditioned in the terms of the compact. Others denied it was a constitutional right, but said it was only a revolutionary right, to be exercised for crime, and that infidelity to the terms or the purposes of union would be sufficient cause to justify the act. But no accepted statesman, North or South, Whig or Democrat, ever contended or claimed that coercion was a right, either constitutional or revolutionary during all that period. So, upon the authority of all our great statesmen, including the very framers of the Constitution, secession will stand in history acquitted and justified, while coercion, upon the same authority, must be condemned as criminal and without excuse.

* * * *

Secession invaded no State—interfered with no right—lessened the privileges of no man. Coercion laid waste the States, enslaved the people, murdered their sons, despoiled their daughters, desolated their homes, and burnt up their property!

And what is reconstruction? It is the practical application of coercion. It is logic turning to facts. It is coercion at its work. It is the torch of the incendiary, the knife of the assassin; the firearm of the bandit, sending its death blows to the life of the State, to the heart of society, and to the hopes of civilization, that ignorance and vice may be exalted, and intelligence and virtue degraded! Do I exaggerate? Look at South Carolina and answer. See the land of Marion and Sumter, of Rutledge and Pinckney, of Calhoun and Butler, the prey and sport of rioting thieves and gluttonous plunderers, lasting days, months, and years in the face of the nation and under Federal protection! Look at Louisiana. Behold a sovereign State sentenced to the chaingang by telegraph from Washington, to work at hard labor under negro and carpet-bag drivers! This, this is the fruit of coercion. These are the works of reconstruction. Have the people of America no shame? Has the God of heaven no wrath? If coercion and reconstruction shall continue, their fruits will multiply until all the people, in agonized unison, shall cry out: surely, several unions were better than one empire, and divided liberty more to be desired than concentrated despotism.

The East River Bridge.

[From New York Correspondent of Montgomery News.]

NEW YORK, March 14, 1874.

In the year 1654, when the thriving town of New-Amsterdam attained to the dignity of a city with full municipal privileges, the toll of three stivers did not seem much to the well-to-do burghers for the passage over to Long Island in the commodious ferryboats which plied regularly between the shores, from a point about where Peck Slip now is to the foot the road in Brooklen, which now bears the name of Fulton street. The Indians were charged double rates—an instance of the justice and wisdom of our New Netherland progenitors, for the savages did not need money as much, nor did they know its value as well as they, who had braved the perils of the ocean and the hardships of forest for its sake. The year 1810 witnessed a rmearkable instance of modern ingenuity in construction of the ferryboats. The old rowboats were superceded by singular new-fangled double boats propelled by means of a great wheel driven about by horses in a treadmill. One of the novel machine boats had eight horses at the engine and made the passage in only fifteen minutes. But the strangest sight was when the citizens of New York witnessed on the 8th of May 1814 a little ship without sails puffing up smoke and steam, flapping the water with outlandish wings at the sides, and scudding over the river for no good reason at all apparently. In the year 1869, however, the people had long ceased their wonderment over steamboats and began to think that not the twenty-five crowded ferryboats crossing and recrossing the East River constantly nor all the steamboats in the world, beaten struggling up or down the stream by the rushing tide as they are and dodging, backing, and hurrying among the shipping would be sufficient for the million passengers weekly, and all the tracks of merchandise, and the multitudinous carriages passing between the great seaport of New York with its million of inhabitants, and the great manufacturing city of Brooklyn with its four hundred thousand.

To know when improvement is needed is well, but the improvement may not come in a long while, particulary an improvement of such magnitude as making two shores meet which are separated by a broad deep arm of the sea. To fill up the stream with stores and thereby obstruct navigation entirely, a scheme which some proposed, would be like cutting away the rigging from one of the queenly merchant vessels, which ride at anchor in the river, in order that the sailors may get about better. Commerce must not in the least degree be hindered or interfered with in New York; it is the city's life and hope, and it will not be long before all the dockroom and all the roadstead in the East River will be nane too much for the requirements of our trade. Another plan was a tunnel like that under the Thames; but the channel of the East River is 60 feet deep, and to tunnel it would be a task for Titans. But to span the river with a gigantic bridge swung above the tall masts, although it would have to be nearly a mile long, and held up by towers higher than the steeple of old Trinity, was a plan which did not dismay the engineers and those who are informed in the records of modern engineering. So a company was formed, and Mr. J. A Roebbling, who was already known to the world as the engineer of the enormous suspension bridges at Niagara Falls and Cincinnati was requested to draw plans for it, and in April 1869 they were accepted by the board of consulting engineers appointed by Congress for the interest of the harbor, and he was appointed to direct the construction of the work. The financial management was to be by an incorporated company, who issued $500,000 of capital stock. This wss supplemented by a public appropriation of $3,000,000 from the city of Brooklyn, and $1,500,000 from the city of New York. The excavation for the East pier was commenced on Jan. 3d, 1870. On the 19th of March, the great caisson, or hollow casing, within which air was compressed five times as dense as above ground to expel the excavated material, was launched, and was long in reaching the required depth of 30 feet below low water. The New York caisson was not sunk until May 1873.

The masonry begun on the Brooklyn side July 15th, 1870, and while the huge caissons, the largest construtions of the kind ever made, were slowly sinking underground, the massy granite blocks from *Maine*, were directly building above them, sinking with them, and helping to press them down with their immense superincumbent weight—they will weigh each 70,000 tons when completed. The work was steadily pushed forward until the cold weather came this winter. The Brooklyin tower has reached the height 220 feet, and the New Tower is completed up to the flooring 119½ feet above high-water mark. As soon as the spring opens, the archways, which are far advanced on the other side, will be commenced. Of the original fund of $5,000,000, only $500,000 remain, and the bridge may cost nearly three times the original estimate. Where these immense sums are to come from is undetermined, but all events, the work will not be abandoned, whether the legislature makes an appropriation for its completion or not. The towers will be 280 feet in height, 134 feet long, and 57 feet wide at the base, with two square hollow spaces within. The length of the entire suspended superstructure will be 4,794 feet, 1,595½ feet over the river from centre to centre, between the piers 930 feet on either side, high over the tops of 1a'feet buildings to where the cables are anchored in a huge mass of masonry, there being no rock available. There it is met on the New York side by a roadway approach, supported by iron pillars and arched masonry 1,562½ feet in length, starting at the City Hall Park, from the foot of Chatham St., gradually rising in an inclination of 3½ feet in every hundred, and running through and over the blocks of buildings, until at at Cherry and Water St., it meets the suspended bridge floor at the height of 90 feet. On the Brooklyn side a similar viaduct will be made 971 feet in length, to the terminus of the bridge about at Washington St. Its length, including the approaches, will be 5,989 feet. It will be supported by four cables of galvanized, tempered cast steel wire, aided by a system of stays, extending from the towers, which Mr. Roebling says are alone able to bear up the central span. The elevation of the main span is 119 feet above high water at the pier lines and 135 feet, in the centre. The floor will have five separate tracks, two for cars going either way, two for vehicles and a central one six feet above the others for foot passengers. There will be two trains of from six to eight carriages constantly running forth and back drawn by endless wire ropes and making the entire passage in five minutes. The suspended superstructure will be of iron. All ships under 1000 tons burden can sail under it as well as all schooners, brigs, and other vessels, but ships of over that tonnage will have to lower their top spars. The East River bridge will be classed among the chief structures of the kind in the world. The first great suspension bridge built, was the one at Freburg in Scotland, and the longest now existing is the Victoria at Montreal, Canada 9194 feet in length, but this will be surpassed by one over the Tay now building in Scotland which will have a length of 10,693 feet, some of the bridges and aqueducts built by the Ancient Romans, such as the aqueduct at Nismes were scarcely less remarkable than the greatest triumphs of modern engineering, Trajan's famous bridge over the Danube was, 4770 feet in length. But there is not to be found in any city one of more usefulness and importance than this East River bridge. It will combine and imply the two cities as no incorporative enactment nor the best intentions of all the citizens could do. The distinctions between Brooklyn and New York will in the future be only one of names; and soon even that distinction will be done away with; for their union under a single charter will be sure to follow if it does not preceed the completion of the bridge. It will change the form and character of the great commercial metropolis to a degree which cannot be calculated. The rapid extension of the city up the narrow Manhattan Island will be arrested; it will spread evenly over other shore, and within a little time perhaps the city over the river will exceed this in population. The change it will make in the appearence of the city will be marvellous. Until we become accustomed to the Cylopean stranger and begin to regard it as a pass of the city we shall feel greatly chagrined to see a broad high way, depending by a thousand chains from its towering piers, passing insolently over our prondest edifices.

N. C. B.
N. Y.

PENSACOLA, FLA. Feb 17 1874.

J. HENRY SYMONDS, Esq., Boston,

Dear Sir,—Were it not that I have so little at my disposal at present I would reply at greater length to your letter of the 20th ult. As it is however, I have canvassed the opinions of our lumber men in this vicinity, and they are generally in favor of and association, such as you suggest, to be composed of delegates from local associations in every sections o the country.

The utility of such an association cannot be questioned, for the purpose of regulating customs and sales inspection. (which ougt to be uniform) and other objects, and I trust that you will advocate the same through the columns of your able paper.

As each section has its own special needs, it would be difficult to name a proper locallty for such an association to meet, but a little ventilation on the subject might determine this.

We propose to continue our efforts in our 'Timber and Lumber Exchange,' towards bringing about a union of feeling &c. among our lumber men here.

Yours truly,
THOS. C. WATSON.